APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,615	11/04/2003	Brian Styles	570-P0002	2412

23334   7590   07/30/2007
FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI
& BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
BAROT, BHARAT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 May 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1.   Claims 1 and 3-7; and new claims 8-22 remain for further examination.

The old rejection maintained

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-22 filed on May 09, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the claims 1 and 3-22. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on February 09, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(e)

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 1 and 3-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pitzel et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,062,765). Pitzel's patent meets all the limitations for the claims 1 and 3-19 recited in the claimed invention.

5.   As to claim 1, Pitzel et al teach a method in a client-server environment, to manage a configuration of resources on at least one client system (see abstract; figure 1; and column 1 lines 6-12), the method on a client system comprising: receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a CPU in a client system is one of a mobile type to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system (figure 1;

column 2 lines 20-38; and column 3 lines 28-63), wherein the one or more selectable

configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with

one or more user selectable configuration settings therein (figure 1; column 3 lines 46-

63; and column 4 lines 8-40); determining if the environmental condition indicates that

the client system is a portable system; and in response to the environmental condition

indicating that the client system is a portable system then applying at least one of the

one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system (figure 1; column 3

lines 46-63; and column 4 lines 41-60).

6.   As to claim 3, Pitzel et al teach that the determining if the environmental

condition is met where the client system is a portable system includes

determining/verifying the client components (hardware/software) and assigning a

confidence value (identifier) to each of the components (figures 2-3; and column 5 line

64 to column 7 line 11).

7.   As to claims 4-5, Pitzel et al teach that the determining if the environmental

condition is met includes applying at least one of the one or more selectable

configuration settings on the client system for an application's default document file

location path and removing any folder redirections to a network resource (figures 4-6;

and column 7 line 15 to column 10 line 30).

8.   As to claims 6-7, Pitzel et al teach that the determining if the environmental

condition is met includes applying at least one of the one or more selectable

configuration settings includes removing any proxy server authentication, which

required for logout and shutdown (figure 7; column 4 lines 31-40; and column 10 line 31

to column 11 line 31).

9.   As to claims 8-19 they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to

rejecting claims 1 and 3-7 above. Additionally, Pitzel et al teach that a PC card driver is

started in a client system and a PC card is inserted in a socket in a client system (figure

1 and columns 3-5).

10.   As to claims 20-22 they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to

rejecting claim 1 3 above. Additionally, Pitzel et al teach that a power supply is present

in a client system (battery/UPS/PPS) (figure 1; and column 3 line 46-63); and a power

supply is present in a computer system is inherent in the art at the time the invention

was made.

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-22 filed on May 09, 2007

have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the claims 1

and 3-22.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

(A)   Argument: Pitzel is silent on: determining if the environmental condition indicates that the client system is a portable system; and in response to the environmental condition indicating that the client system is a portable system then applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system.

Response: Pitzel explicitly teaches that determining if the environmental condition indicates that the client system is a portable system; and in response to the environmental condition indicating that the client system is a portable system then applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system (figure 1; column 3 lines 46-63; and column 4 lines 41-60).

(B)   Argument: No detection of a portable client system 104 is taught or suggested by Pitzel for applying configuration settings.

Response: Pitzel explicitly teaches that determining if the environmental condition indicates that the client system is a portable system; and in response to the environmental condition indicating that the client system is a portable system then applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system (figure 1; columns 3-4).

(C) **Argument:** Pitzel does not suggest, mention or teach any of these terms "a client

CPU is a mobile type"; "a PC Card driver is started"; "a PC Card is inserted in a socket";

"a system battery is present"; "an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) is connected"; and

"a portable power scheme is selected in an operating system" and using one or more of

the confidence values to determine if the client system is a laptop.

Response: Pitzel explicitly teaches that receiving at least one local run-time

environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a CPU in a

client system is one of a mobile type to determine whether one or more selectable

configuration settings are applied on the client system (figure 1; column 2 lines 20-38;

and column 3 lines 28-63). Also, Pitzel teaches that a PC card driver is started in a

client system and a PC card is inserted in a socket in a client system (figure 1 and

columns 3-5); and a power supply is present in a client system (battery/UPS/PPS)

(figure 1; and column 3 line 46-63). NOTE: a power supply is present in a computer

system is inherent in the art at the time the invention was made.

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final
action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the
event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action
and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH
shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date
the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be
calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the
statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this
final action.

Contact Information

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571) 272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

Bharat Barot.
BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

July 12, 2007